

Defining a Comprehensive Threat Model for High Performance Computational Clusters

Dmitry Mogilevsky^{*‡}, Adam Lee[‡], William Yurcik^{*}

^{*}National Center for Supercomputing Applications (NCSA)

[‡]Computer Science Department
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign (UIUC)

{dmogilev,adamlee,byurcik}@ncsa.uiuc.edu

1st February 2008

Abstract

Over the past decade, high performance computational (HPC) clusters have become mainstream in academic and industrial settings as accessible means of computation. Throughout their proliferation, HPC security has been a secondary concern to performance. It is evident, however, that ensuring HPC security presents different challenges than the ones faced when dealing with traditional networks. To design suitable security measures for high performance computing, it is necessary to first realize the threats faced by such an environment. This task can be accomplished by the means of constructing a comprehensive threat model. To our knowledge, no such threat model exists with regards to Cluster Computing. In this paper, we explore the unique challenges of securing HPCs and propose a threat model based on the classical Confidentiality, Integrity and Availability security principles.

1 Introduction

Cluster computing now constitutes over 60% of the top 500 high performance computing resources in the world[12], with top-performing clusters such as IBM's Blue Gene reaching peak speed of over 180 TFlops across more than 65,000 nodes [13]. HPCs are used for a variety of research and industry tasks many of which are either mission-critical or sensitive by nature, making clusters an attractive target for industry espionage or sabotage. Additionally, the cluster itself, with its highly desirable resources such as powerful computational capacities, high-bandwidth network connection and massive storage, which can

be employed for a DoS attack, brute force password cracking[8] or illegitimate FTP servers, make it an attractive target for attackers. An example of such an attack took place in spring of 2004, when attacks on facilities in multiple institutions took place [4].

Attempts to secure the cluster computing environments currently suffer from lack of an integrated security approach that takes advantage of the intrinsic properties of cluster computing. Applying traditional security measures to individual nodes of the cluster is an inadequate measure, as it fails to take into consideration the overall context of the system. For example, a node may be communicating on a port that appears legitimate to the security system running on that node. If the security system were able to interface with the scheduler, it would learn that no job is scheduled to be running on that node, therefore there should be no communication taking place[15]. In order to be able to define a comprehensive approach to securing a cluster, we must first strive to completely understand the threats and security risks that are present in cluster computing environment.

The best approach to analyzing the threats faced by a computing environment is through a systematic threat-analysis approach, or threat modelling. Threat modelling involves systematically identifying the assets in the system, creating an architectural overview of the system, and identifying the threats at each stage of the system[5]. Once the threats are identified, a risk assesment analysis is performed to determine whether it is more efficient to mitigate the threat or accept the risk of it being exploited. Security mechanisms are then developed to mitigate the threats which are determined to be unacceptable. This process allows security engineers to effectively identify which security measures are necessary. This ensures that the necessary mechanisms are put in place, while the unnecessary ones are left unimplemented[3].

The purpose of this paper is to effectively and comprehensively identify the threats faced by cluster computing¹. We chose to use the classical Confidentiality, Integrity and Availability (CIA) security model, a well-accepted and time-proven paradigm in the security community, as a basis for our threat model. We discuss the unique aspects of a clustered computing network as compared to traditional networks, and how the challenges these aspects present within the framework of the CIA model. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to use a structured CIA approach to creating a comprehensive threat model for clusters.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the unique aspects of cluster computing as they relate to security assurance. In Section 3 we briefly survey the previous work on defining a comprehensive cluster security model. We then discuss our threat model in section 4 of the paper, and offer a summary and some concluding remarks in section 5.

¹The risk assessment portion of the security analysis process depends in large part on the workload and data sensitivity of each individual cluster, as well as details of its architecture, and as such, best left for the cluster administrator to perform.

2 Security Challenges of Cluster Computing

As high speed computing continues to shift from mainframe to commodity CPU clusters, it is important to note several emerging properties in this new computing environment, which directly contribute to the difficulty in maintaining a secure computing environment.

2.1 Clusters are highly customizable

Clusters can be thought of as high speed networks of commodity processors. As such, there is not a single definition of what a typical cluster 'profile' is. Varied factors among clusters include node quantity, CPU and chipset choice, operating system, cluster management software, such as Rocks and OSCAR, and interconnect, such as Infiniband, Myrinet and many others[2].

2.2 Clusters are often highly heterogeneous

Frequently, clusters are deployed incrementally, and with different components. As such, clusters can often be found to contain a highly heterogeneous mix of hardware devices and software configurations. This presents a security challenge that is both local and distributed. On one hand, each distinct configuration has unique needs in terms of patching and node hardening. On the other hand, lack of homogeneity hinders deployment of integrated security solution across the whole cluster [10].

2.3 Performance-First mentality

Clusters are designed to be a high performance computing tool. As such, it is a common practice to maximize the performance potential and accessibility of clusters, often at expense of security. One such example is the practice of exposing all of the cluster's nodes to public networks in order to allow users to login directly to computing nodes and run their jobs. The emergence of cluster grid computing and on-demand computing has accenuated this problem, since these paradigms require all nodes to be accessible to outside connections for optimal effectiveness. Another example is disabling SSH authentication between nodes to reduce job start up time.

2.4 Edge-based security measures model

As part of the performance-first paradigm described above, security measures in clusters, such as secure authentication login are often concentrated along the edges of the cluster. As a result, once an attacker gains access to the cluster, there may not be significant obstacles to what he can do inside.

2.5 Cluster size

As clusters grow in size, it become increasingly difficult to guarantee secure state operation in every one of the components. Increasing the size of the cluster also increases the attack space and heightens the possibility that a determined attacker can locate and exploit a possibility in the system to gain access to one of the nodes. Given the security oversight discussed in previous section, finding one vulnerable node is often all an attacker needs.

These aspects clearly differentiate clusters from classical network security realms. As a result, cluster security cannot be addressed in the same way that traditional network security is addressed. In light of the fact that a cluster presents a very different set of challenges to both attackers and security engineers, and contains vastly different set of assets to potential attackers, cluster security must be examined within the framework of a different threat model than one faced by traditional networks.

3 Previous Work

To the best of our knowledge, no work has been done on developing a comprehensive threat model for cluster computing, to the best of our knowledge. In [7], the authors define a threat model for Grid computing at a very high level and without focusing on the specific security challenges of the clusters that are outlined in this work. In [14], three specific attacks on clusters are presented. In [10, 15], the unique properties of cluster security are addressed, and a limited threat model, along with a proposal for an integrated cluster security tool is given.

4 Attack Identification

To create a strong threat model of a system, several questions must be addressed. The first step of developing a threat model is to identify the potential assets of the system. An asset in threat modeling is defined as an entity or a feature of a system that is of interest to the attacker, and as such, gaining access to these assets is the motivation behind the attack [11]. It is the case, however, that assets represent entities or features that are desired for legitimate users as well, therefore it is not a practical approach to eliminate the motivation for attacks by eliminating the assets. Secondly, we must identify potential entry points into the system which can be exploited by the attacker in order to gain illegitimate access. Entry points can be intentional, such as a public login script, or unintentional, such as an open port or a buffer overflow vulnerability in a running library. Finally, given the existing assets and entry points, we enumerate what attacks can be launched in order to gain access to each given asset.

It is imperative to follow the above steps when designing a threat model. Threat modeling requires a systematic and repeatable approach, which is not

achievable by simply brainstorming the question “How can I be attacked?” [6]. One must consider not only the assets at risk and the vulnerabilities of the system, but also non-technical questions, such as, who is going to be launching the attacks (defacers, industrial spies, script kiddies, etc.), and what is the motivation behind the attacks (financial gain, access to computing resources, etc) [3].

A few words on our attacker model. We refer to anyone who wishes to circumvent the normal operation state of the cluster as an ‘attacker’. This is a diverse qualification that can include a bored teenager hacking from home, a malicious hacker attempting to steal confidential information from the cluster, a disgruntled employee, or a legitimate, but dishonest cluster user who is attempting to get more cluster resources at the expense of other users. Though these people may have very different goals in mind, we group them together as potential attackers.

We choose to classify attacks on clusters using the Confidentiality-Integrity-Availability threat classification. CIA security model is a seminal classification model in information assurance studies and provides a more clear-cut separation than newer, alternative models such as STRIDE [11].

Assets. As we have briefly mentioned already, a large-scale cluster is highly attractive to attackers both for the data contained in it and the physical resources that it provides. We identify the following assets in the cluster that an attacker might try to get access to.

- User login data
- User job data
- System logs
- Scheduler
- Storage systems
- Intranode network fabric
- Computing cycles
- Network packets

Entry Points. Given the challenges of securing clusters we’ve discussed in section 2, there are many entry points which the attacker might utilize to compromise the cluster. These include,

- Known vulnerabilities in SSH
- Remote cluster management software
- Open ports
- Stolen login information

- Rogue processes/rootkits

We now present the CIA threat model for cluster security. To do so, we describe how the enumerated entry points can be used in order to gain access to cluster resources in order to launch attacks against Confidentiality, Integrity and Availability of the cluster.

4.1 CIA Model

The Confidentiality-Integrity-Availability model is an attractive way to differentiate attacks. The three properties of the model are key aspects that must be guaranteed in a secure computing system. Although there may be some overlap in how an attack can be categorized (for example, a confidentiality attack can also be an integrity attack), we choose to group attacks to a single group explicitly

4.1.1 Confidentiality

Confidentiality ensures that only the entities authorized to read information and access resources can do so. Confidentiality attacks focus on gaining access to resources without having the proper authorization to do so[9]. Gaining illegitimate root access to the system represents the ultimate confidentiality attack, however, an attacker may still learn much without the capability to login to the cluster.

- *Snooping on External Network.* Cluster users are frequently allowed to submit jobs over the network. This presents a number of snooping opportunities. An attacker may learn when a certain user is running a job (and on which node, if the user is allowed to connect to compute nodes directly). An attacker may attempt to capture user data being transferred onto the cluster, or correlate input/output transmissions to infer information about the size of the job the user is running.
- *Snooping on Internal Network.* Messages on the internal cluster network are often left unencrypted for efficiency reasons. If a malicious insider attacker manages to gain access to the communication fabric, or by capturing a node and putting it in promiscuous mode, an attacker can easily intercept data and control packets.
- *Scheduler/Metadata Compromise.* If an attacker manages to get administrative access to the head node of the cluster, he will be able to examine scheduler logs and job metadata information to learn about currently running jobs and what jobs have users run in the past.
- *Resource Subversion - Computational.* An attacker who has gained access to a single cluster node, may, unless the cluster is specifically configured to disallow this, bypass the scheduler altogether and launch a job from shell. This grants the attacker unauthorized access to the computational

resources of the cluster, enabling him to perform illegitimate tasks such as hashing values for an offline dictionary attack.

- *Resource Subversion - Storage.* Likewise, an attacker who gained access to a single cluster node may implicitly also gain access to the storage resources of the cluster. The storage may be used to house and serve warez, pornography or other illegal material. This is especially severe if the attacker gains enough access to open an unprotected port on the cluster through which such connections can be handled.

4.1.2 Integrity

Integrity ensures that all modifications done to the data are done by entities that are authorized to do so. Integrity attacks violate this condition by enabling modification for entities not approved for doing so. Modification is understood to mean creating, changing, appending, writing and deleting user and meta data.

- *Internal Network Packet Injection.* An attacker who gains access to the internal network of cluster can use it to send legitimate-looking packets with incorrect data to other nodes. For example, the attacker may attempt to subvert a computation by sending packets with incorrect data in them.
- *Scheduler Tampering.* An attacker who has gained administrative access to the scheduler may tamper with it, in order to preempt other jobs running on the cluster (this can also be classified as an availability attack), or to give his own job higher priority.
- *Log Tampering.* Cooperative clusters often allocate a quota of computing cycles for each user. By tampering with logs, an attacker can modify other people's remaining quotas or his own quota, if the attacker is a legitimate user.
- *Data Tampering.* With a significantly authoritative access, the attacker can modify user data on the storage nodes at a whim. In lieu of sufficient backup, this can be particularly disastrous, since data residing on the storage nodes is generally the result of hundreds of hours of computations.

4.1.3 Availability

Availability ensures that the resources are available to people who are authorized to access them when they wish to access them. The goal of an availability attack is to make the resource unavailable to the intended users - what is known as a *Denial of Service* attack. Unlike Confidentiality and Integrity, which have been extensively studied and modeled, availability is a more fleeting property to define.

- *Exhausting Log Space.* Depending on the cluster configuration, exhausting log space may be an effective availability attack if the cluster is configured to reject any submitted jobs that it is unable to log.
- *Exhausting Scratch Space.* An improperly configured cluster may allow users to store data on the same partition that is used for computation scratch space by the cluster. Exhausting this space will cause the cluster to have insufficient disk storage to execute a job.
- *Exhausting Storage Space.* An attacker may attempt to completely fill up the existing storage space, making it impossible for legitimate users to store the results of their jobs.
- *Scheduling DoS.* An attacker may schedule a repetitive, non-expiring job (such as a simple program with an infinite loop) to run on all the computing nodes of the cluster, thus denying legitimate users the ability to launch jobs.

5 Summary and Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a threat model for cluster computing. Computing clusters differ from traditional networks in design and approach, and present a unique security challenge compared to them. Additionally, a cluster has several properties which make it a highly desirable target for an attack. In their current state, many clusters have a shell of varying crunchiness on the outside, and a very soft, unprotected inside. We presented a CIA model which demonstrates that upon breaking into a cluster through a single node, there is very little limit imposed on what the attacker can do while inside, in terms of Confidentiality, Integrity and Availability. The inherent conclusion that can be drawn is that while securing the individual nodes and preventing break-ins is important, much effort need to be put into securing the cluster from the inside out, with the emergent properties of cluster computing in mind.

References

- [1] Mark Baker, Geoffrey Fox, Hon Yau. "Cluster Computing Review". Center for Research on Parallel Computing. Tech. Rep. CRPC-TR95. 1995.
- [2] Mark Baker. "Cluster Computing White Paper". University of Portsmouth. V. 1.01. 2001.
- [3] Rahib Hasan, Suvda Myagmar, Adam J. Lee, William Yurcik. "Toward a threat Model for Storage Security". International Workshop on Storage Security and Survivability (StorageSS) in conjunction with 12th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2005) , November 11, 2005.

- [4] Brian Krebs. "Hackers Strike Advanced Computing Networks". Washington Post. 04/13/2004.
- [5] Microsoft Corp. "Threat Model Your Security Risks". MSDN Magazine. Nov. 2003.
- [6] Suvda Myagmar, Adam Lee, William Yurcik. "Threat Modeling as a Basis for Security Requirements". Symposium on Requirements Engineering in Information Security, August 2005.
- [7] Syed Naqvi, Michel Riguidel. "Threat Model for Grid Security Systems". European Grid Computing Conference 2005 (EGC2005).
- [8] Tom Perrine, Devin Kowatch. "Teracrack: Password cracking using TeraFLOP and PetaByte Resources". San Diego Supercomputer Center, 2003. <http://security.sdsc.edu/publications/teracrack.pdf>
- [9] Charles Pfleeger, Shari Pfleeger. *Security in Computing*. Prentice Hall, 2003.
- [10] Makan Pourzandi, David Gordon, William Yurcik, and Gregory A. Koenig, "Clusters and Security: Toward Distributed Security for Distributed Systems", IEEE Cluster Computing and Grid (CCGrid), May 2005.
- [11] Frank Swiderski, Window Snyder, *Threat Modeling*, Microsoft Press, 2004.
- [12] Top 500. "Charts for June 2005 - Architecturs". Available at <http://www.top500.org/lists/2005/06/charts.php?c=1>.
- [13] Top 500. "System Info: BlueGene/L". Available at <http://www.top500.org/sublist/System.php?id=7605>.
- [14] Miguel Torres, Rayford B. Vaughn, German Florez, Zhen Liu, Susan M. Bridge, "Attacking a High Performance Computer Cluster", Proceedings of the 15th Annual Canadian Information Technology Security Symposium, May 2003.
- [15] William Yurcik, Gregory A. Koenig, Xin Meng, and Joseph Greenesid, "Cluster Security as a Unique Problem with Emergent Properties: Issues and Techniques", 5th LCI International Conference on Linux Clusters, Presentation, May 2004.